



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/597,297	06/20/2000	William J. Buisman	47004.000054	6182

21967 7590 04/01/2005

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

WEISBERGER, RICHARD C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/597,297

Applicant(s)

BUISMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Richard C Weisberger

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/11/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 13-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The routing steps are vague and indefinite with respect to the algorithm for routing a form to a repair system based on a code identifier. Also the step of processing comprising a workflow contingent on the type of error received from external data entry operators at external validation and repair systems is vague and indefinite. At what point does a system come external. The step of processing according to a contingent workflow comprises processing forms as parsed snippets when the form code identifier can be determined, and processing forms as full images when the form code identifier can not be determined is confusing. The code identifiers are said to be part and parcel of the form as opposed to information filled in by the user. Is the code unreadable or unidentifiable.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 3624

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 13-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardiff, Cardiff Teleform Elite.

The reference teaches a computer implemented method for converting previously coded forms to electronic format, including receiving forms, the forms including form code identifiers on the forms, reading the forms into electronic format based on computer implemented character recognition, determining the form code identifiers for the forms, assigning priorities to the forms based on the determination of the form code identifiers, wherein at least some of the priorities for some forms are different from the assigned priorities for other forms; routing the forms to different validation and repair systems based on the determined form code identifiers, and processing the forms for validation (see pages 1-4). With respect to processing according to a contingent workflow comprises processing forms as parsed snippets when the form code identifier can be determined, and processing forms as full images when the form code identifier can not be determined.

The reference fails to expressly teach of assigning priorities to the forms and processing the forms for so called repair according to a contingent workflow, the contingent workflow being based at least in part on priorities assigned to forms and making the form data available to a subsequent process. The reference does teach generic customizable processing steps including address comparison with a previously known

Art Unit: 3624


database and passing the documents and data to back office applications. Thus, the prior art teaches that character recognition / comparison with previous databases is an art recognized method. Therefore having compared the form to a database and passing the document and its contents for subsequent processing the forms are inherently prioritized. While the examiner is not able to determine if the form is subsequently sent to a repair system, it seems reasonable to believe that this feature is inherent in the system. That is once having identified the error, correction of the error would be the next step. In the alternative, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include a routing mechanism for forms that are incomplete. The examiner takes official notice of exception handling (errors) in the file of document retrieval. With respect to processing according to a contingent workflow comprises processing forms as parsed snippets when the form code identifier can be determined, and processing forms as full images when the form code identifier can not be determined. It also seems reasonable that this step is inherent in the system described by the reference. If for example an unidentifiable form was faxed into the system, the form would be rejected in its entirety.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard C Weisberger whose telephone number is 703 308 4408.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vince Millin can be reached on 703 308 1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Richard C. Weisberger
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3624